DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 669 HE 027 553

AUTHOR Dooley, Larry M.
TITLE Barriers and Inducements to Grant Related Activity by a College of Education Faculty.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 94
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April, 4-8 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Promotion; Grants; *Grantsmanship; Higher Education; *Incentives; Program Proposals; Proposal Writing; Research Universities; *Schools of Education; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Texas A and M University

ABSTRACT

A study was done involving a survey of existing barriers and inducements to grant-related activities among tenured faculty within the college of education at Texas A&M University. An already established effort to increase grant activity included the position of Associate Dean of Research with the responsibility for increasing the level of external funding and efforts to establish a clearly defined research culture. Consequently grants and contracts had dramatically increased in recent years. For this study all 106 tenure track faculty in the College of Education were surveyed of which 58 returned usable surveys. Survey findings revealed that a large percentage of faculty feel involvement in grant related activity is worth the trade-off for time spent on other scholarly efforts especially from a tenure and promotion standpoint. In fact 84 percent of those responding felt consideration in promotion and tenure decision was a very important factor regarding their involvement in the grant and contract process. Faculty perception affirmed the difficulties involved in developing a grant proposal. To help minimize the burden, most faculty requested that the university support the time consuming development process with release time and administrative support. Few respondents thought that recognition in a college publication was important. Detailed analysis of the survey responses are attached. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 669

Barriers and Inducements to Grant Related Activity by a College of Education Faculty

by

Larry M. Dooley
Assistant Professor
Educational Human Resource Development
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-3256
Voice: (409)845-5300
Fax: (409)845-0409
E-Mail: LDOOLEY@SUMMA.TAMU.EDU

Prepared for the

American Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana

April 4-8, 1994

HE027533

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry M. Dooley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Faculty in colleges and universities have been involved in grant writing and other income generating scholarship for some time. However, in the past this was generally limited to the hard sciences and an occasional grant award to educators in a field that was "hot" at the time. With dwindling resources affecting all faculties, the entire academy must be involved in extra mural funding or face the consequence of loss of programs.

The College of Education at Texas A&M University has entered into an evolution process to change their research culture to encourage more faculty participation in extra mural funding. To that end, they have created an infrastructure from the research office that offers assistance to faculty in grant procurement and management.

In the spring of 1993, Thomas C. Monahan published a study in the *SRA Journal* that surveyed faculty in colleges in New Jersey to determine the barriers and inducements to grant related activity. This researcher was intrigued by Monahan's study and decided to use his study as a basis for surveying faculty in the College of Education at Texas A&M University.

Background

Grant related research studies have focused on the Barriers and obstacles that have hindered professionals in their pursuit in obtaining grants, and the incentives and inducements that have allowed them to succeed in winning these rewards. These studies pinpoint mechanisms that have helped faculty in grant writing activities (Monahan 1993, p. 9).

Internal economic pressure and the escalating economic cost of higher education are reshaping the priorities of University faculty. Throughout the 1980's

and 1990's, external funding has become an important source of income for Universities, where 13 percent of the revenues have come from grants and similar contracts (Brinkman & Leslie p. 2). Burgoon concluded that, "more than ever, with declining percentages of state budgets allocated to higher education, academics who wish to engage in first-class scholarly research are going to have to find ways to support themselves" (p, 258). The increasing exigency to secure grant funding has created an increased urgency for faculty to examine grant writing as an activity necessary for professional advancement.

Increased pressure to succeed in obtaining grant funds has exposed a deficiency in the ability of universities and staff to proceed in securing funds. This deficiency has been fueled by a grant submission process, that is inherently intimidating. Ensuing from these inabilities, universities began to develop seminars and engage in research to improve faculty ability (Lischwe & Manning 1987, p. 49).

Throughout these decades subsequent studies focused on improving conditions which can increase the success rate of obtaining federal grants. Churchman and Hellweg (1981) concluded that to increase the number of grants received the following institutional obstacles must be addressed: (1) higher teaching loads, (2) smaller faculties, (3) failure of administrators to recognize the importance of grants, (4) attitude of faculty toward grants, (5) lack of administrative support (6) superfluous procedures (p. 110).

In 1984, assessing perceptions and attitudes, Cook and Loadman (1984) compiled a list of perceived truths about grant proposal development. Their endorsements included: (1) know the funding source, (2) write clearly and precisely, (3) the proposing agency reputation makes a difference, (4) the clarity of the proposal is important, (5) staff capability is important, (6) documentation of costs is essential in budget preparation, (7) developing a proposal does not guarantee

funding, (8) there should be flexibility in budgeting, (9) you can not miss the deadline for submitting a proposal (p. 298).

During the same year, Lischwe and Manning (1984) delivered a grant development seminar to increase external fund raising activity among the faculty at Illinois University at Edwardsville. The seminar was based on a multiple of grant developing difficulties which included: (1) finding an appropriate funding agency, (2) completing a sound, well-written, persuasive proposal, (3) mastering budget preparation, (4) and navigating bureaucratic regulations (p. 49).

Mishler (1987) reported that in the fiscal year of 1983 - 1984 efforts were taken by the Board of Curators at the University Of Missouri - Kansas City (UMKC) to identify campus wide mechanisms to reach their long term goals to (a) enhance research capabilities and (b) double sponsored funding by 1990 (p. 137).

Grants awarded to UMKC increased from 32% of those submitted to 56% between the fiscal years 1985-1986 to 1986-1987, using the following incentives: (1) research-oriented faculty development programs, (2) merit system to enhance salaries for securing funds, (3) reduced teaching loads, (4) personnel and financial record-keeping systems, (5) and goal setting systems (Mishler 1987, p. 141).

In 1989 Gallaher and Daniel conducted a study to determine impediments for grant writing within the department of education at a large public university. A questionnaire survey indicated that although faculty members viewed grant activity as being important, many did not routinely pursue this type of funding due to the following impediments: (1) lack of time, (2) lack of information about funding sources, (3) lack of procedural information, (4) and lack of a clearly defined system of rewards for obtaining funding (p. 1).

This study also noted three incentives to grant writing which included: (1) developing a clearly defined reward system, (2) providing release time for the

activity of pursuing grants, (3) administrative support for the implementation of the grant writing process (Gallaher & Daniel 1989, p. 1).

Monahan's (1993) study was among the most recent research conducted on grant writing barriers and incentives. The study randomly surveyed 260 full-time faculty at eight state colleges. Monahan reported that the following obstacles were found to prevent faculty from participating in grant related activities: (1) heavy teaching loads, (2) scholarly and entrepreneurial interests, (3) committee or other such administrative assignments, (4) and lack of advance warning of funding opportunities (p. 9).

Furthermore, Monahan found that faulty members needed technical assistance in seeking external sources of funding, help in preparing proposals and budgets, getting the necessary approvals, and assistance in dealing with sponsors, however, few faculty reported that they received help completing these tasks (p. 9).

Monahan (1993) further proposed eight recommendations to encourage and motivate faculty to further their involvement in the grant development process. Recommendations were: (1) create a grants or sponsored-project office, (2) provide in this office grant specialists who will actively assist, (3) develop a grant and contracts handbook which includes college policies, (4) offer workshops and seminars, (5) provide tangible rewards for grant writing, (6) promote collegial work, (7) communicate clearly and frequently the value of scholarly activity, (8) and include a grant development course in the graduate curricula (p. 23-24).

This background study pinpoints areas that have been documented as incentives and barriers to grant writing activity. The present study was designed to build on these areas by conducting a survey of existing barriers and inducements to tenured faculty within the college of education at a major southwestern university subsequent to a formal established process to increase this activity.

The Texas A&M University Climate

Established in 1876, Texas A&M University is the oldest public institution of higher learning in Texas and is the only university in the country to be ranked nationally among the top 10 in total enrollment, enrollment of new National Merit Scholars, value of research and size of endowment. More specifically, the University's research funding is approaching $305 million and is ranked eighth among the nation's research universities by the National Science Foundation.

Since the beginning of the College of Education at Texas A&M University in 1969, teaching, research, and service have maintained prominent positions in the mission statements of the college. However, much available resources have been directed into the teaching mission with dramatically less resources being channeled into the service and research missions. As the university evolved and achieved its position among the leading research universities in the country, the College of Education expanded its teaching mission to serve a more diverse population. Programs expanded and the number of undergraduate and graduate students completing degrees increased. Research agendas, although encouraged, were not actively promoted. This situation resulted in a relatively level amount of external funding and published works coming out of the college. As time passed, the university came to expect all colleges to place greater emphasis on their research missions. This expectation of the university for the College of Education is quite explicit.

From the beginning of the College of Education in 1969 through 1989, the level of external funding was relatively constant, rarely surpassing the $1 million mark. However, with the change in administration of the College of Education, a new position, Associate Dean of Research, was established to dramatically increase the level of external funding. Under the able leadership of the college administration, the establishment of a clearly defined research culture as discussed

in the subsequent paragraphs, began to reap immediate benefits. Grants and contracts dramatically increased each year and now stands to surpass the $10 million dollar plateau for the first time.

Establishment of a Research Culture

This new research culture was to dramatically increase extra mural funding, and therefore reduce the burden on appropriated funding. Therefore, the College of Education adopted the following plan:

(1) Establish sufficient administrative/technical support staffs to assure that quality support and project management will occur. The following individuals were employed or their services contracted: additional bookkeeper to manage the fiscal aspects of projects, technical writer/editor to assist in the development of the proposal, and two additional research and editorial assistants to: edit a newsletter listing research opportunities, conduct literature searches, and serve as a proof reader. These last two positions were allocated only for the first three years. They have been completely phased out this year.

(2) Establish a Research Council for the College of Education to provide policy recommendations on the research mission. This group meets monthly and has developed guidelines for small incentive grants, travel grants, and research fellowships. Most of the membership are successful principal investigators and lend high credibility to the Council.

(3) Foster the development of a college-wide Research Culture. This objective was accomplished by providing start-up funds for faculty research agendas and infrastructure to enable proposals to be submitted with ease. Using partial indirect cost returns or other sources, the Research Council established procedures to award $6,000 in small grants.

(4) Establish the College of Education Fellows Program. This program awarded a total of $4,000 to selected Principal Investigators to use to support their research agendas. The allocation included $1,000 in travel and operating funds to the researcher plus an additional $3,000 in release time to the department for a period of three years. These fellows were also available to mentor new faculty. The funds used for this program came from indirect cost returns to the college.

(5) Establish opportunities for faculty to maintain and upgrade research and technological skills through scheduled seminars and intercession short courses. A college-wide calendar of activities was developed and promoted. The Research Fellows annually present a series of seminars related to faculty development.

(6) Establish a Research Center for the College of Education to highlight the centrality of knowledge production as a lay mission of the College. This Center fosters the development and promotion of research agendas in cognitive science-learning assessment, instructional technology, teacher preparation models, models for family literacy, and interdisciplinary curriculum projects.

(7) Promote research and scholarly products being published by faculty. We have developed a display case that exhibits scholarly research products produced by College of Education faculty; developed a research column for the College of Education Newsletter that goes to all graduates from the College as well as friends of the College; and developed an External Funding Report which provides an accounting of external awards and major findings resulting from funded projects.

With the above policies in place for three years, this researcher was intrigued by the findings of Monahan and sought to discover how these policies, although effecting total dollars received, have affected the perceived barriers or inducements for grant related activities by the faculty in the College of Education.

Data Collection and Methodology

This study will eventually be a national data base sampling mostly Land-Grant Colleges of Education. It is envisioned that ultimately other disciplines will be surveyed as well. For the purposes of this study all tenure track faculty (106) in the College of Education were surveyed. Questionnaires were then developed, pilot tested and distributed to each faculty with a cover letter from the researcher.

Instrumentation

The five page instrument began by collecting information relating to the characteristics of the respondent such as gender, rank, tenure status, length of teaching experience, and teaching/research field. An additional question asked whether they knew if the College operated a sponsored projects office. Questions also asked if the respondents received release time to prepare the proposal or work on a successful proposal; if there was a return on indirect cost to the department; did they receive administrative support such as recognition in college publications or additional travel funds to cultivate grants; and did successful grants provide benefits toward promotion and tenure. Moreover, faculty were asked to rank factors such as heavy teaching load, heavy advising load, campus review/approval requirements, lack of knowledge of budgeting, etc. as discouraging them from becoming involved in grant-seeking. Final questions asked the respondents to rate the importance of release time. administrative support, recognition, etc. toward grant writing. Moreover, they were asked to rate both the importance of a college sponsored research office, and the frequency they received assistance from this office.

Sample Characteristics

Usable surveys were returned from 58 of the total 106 tenure track faculty in the population, a response rate of 55%. Checks were performed that determined the returns were fairly distributed across all departments, with no department being over or under represented. Follow-up contact with non-respondents indicated no systematic non response bias present. Additionally, checks were made to assess the representativeness of the respondents in terms of faculty characteristics. These checks revealed that the respondents generally did not represent the faculty population in terms of gender as 58% of the males responded whereas only 45% of the females responded. The respondents are slightly over represented by senior faculty (52% versus 43% of the population). Representation of teaching experience and academic discipline almost mirror the population.

Data Analysis

The survey findings reveal, from a faculty perspective, a large percentage of the faculty feel involvement in grant related activity is worth the trade-off for time spent on other scholarly productivity. Especially from a tenure and promotion standpoint, in fact 84% of those responding felt consideration in promotion and tenure decisions was a very important factor regarding their involvement in the grant and contract process.

Incentives to Grant Writing

Because proposal development, preparation and writing is so time consuming, it is not surprising that 75% of the respondents reported that release time to prepare a proposal is very important, and 4% reported they had been granted this release time. Another important consideration was the fact that 93%

of the respondents said administrative support such as personnel, travel and equipment was critical during the proposal preparation phase, and 18% of the respondents reported having been given this type of support. Consideration in promotion and tenure decisions was rated as very important relative to grant writing by 54% of the faculty, and 47% said they had received this consideration. And finally, recognition in college publications was rated as very important by 18% of the respondents, and 30% of those responding have received this recognition. Of the other satisfiers on the survey, the satisfaction of receiving the grant was listed as a very important incentive by 47% of the respondents, whereas having the opportunity to support promising ideas was rated very important by 76%, building a reputation for the program rated high by 56% and having the extra resources for equipment was rated high by 52% of the respondents.

Barriers to Writing Grants

Faculty in this survey noted several obstacles to becoming involved in grant related activity. Among those most noted were heavy teaching load, other scholarly or entrepreneurial interests, departmental or college assignments, and the most cited reason was receiving the information too late to prepare a competitive proposal. Moreover, the findings here compare favorably with other similar studies that the technical requirements offer little disincentives to grant writing. These include sponsor rules, lack of training in grant writing, knowledge of the funding source, and lack of knowledge of budgeting. One should not assume this means that all faculty understand fully the mechanics of grant writing, only that the other disincentives are great enough to cause the potential grant writer to make a decision not to write the grant therefore never having to discover the items such as sponsor rules, budgeting, funding source, etc.

Importance of the College Grants Office

Faculty were asked to rate the importance of receiving technical assistance in the preparation and submission of proposals as well as rate the frequency they had in fact received such support. Some very interesting results were discovered. Although 74% reported it was at least important for them to have help in locating grant opportunities, and 59% reported receiving such help. One must be very careful to not jump to the conclusion that help as not provided. All RFAs are provided to faculty and department heads routinely. Faculty must be proactive to a certain extent as well. As one would expect, 69% of the respondents felt technical assistance was critical in writing competitive proposals, only 28% reported as ever receiving this help. This is another deceptive finding as the Principal Investigator (P.I.) must request this technical help and, must have a completed proposal about a week prior to the deadline to allow time for the technical writer to review and comment, and allow the P.I. time to incorporate the changes and still make the deadline. Needless to say, most P.I.s never allow this much lead time! Again, 78% said help was necessary in budget preparation, and 48% received this help. This researcher believes there maybe a misconception on this finding as **all** budgets are reviewed by the college research office and corrections are suggested to the P.I. where necessary. An interesting finding is the one area the research office has made great strides. They will process all proposals for over night delivery and make the connection with the air freight office for the faculty member. The findings showed 71% of the faculty felt this important, and 55% reported receiving this help.

Discussion

Over taxed appropriated funds and the escalating cost of operating a institution of higher learning are reshaping the priorities of University faculty. As financial resources diminish Colleges are forced to find alternative funding to

support both teaching and research activities. This changing university mission has placed emphasis on new skills such as, budget development, proposal writing, and processing packages for overnight delivery. Conducted in 1992 the Monahan study concluded that some faculty members find the grant writing procedure to be intimidating, time consuming, risky, and that only 20% were actively engaged. Monahan revealed faculty members struggling to facilitate new procedures, locating grant providers, and securing these funds.

Intrigued by Monahan's findings this researcher conducted a survey designed to describe how the college of education faculty perceives the ability of the College Grants Office to provide help in these areas, improving attitudes toward grant writing, and increasing their ability to win these rewards.

Faculty perception is a affirmation of the difficulties involved in developing a grant proposal. To help minimize the burden, most faculty requested that the university support the time consuming development process, requesting that the university provide release time and administrative support for these activities. A majority of faculty members reported that it was very important to receive this support, however, very few had received it. This should come as no surprise because proposal development, preparation and writing is extremely time consuming and faculty are often trying to juggle time commitments associated with proposal development, with commitments demanded by other university objectives, such as teaching and service. Faculty members clearly want a tangible commitment by the University to support their external efforts.

Furthermore, a majority of faculty members recognized the importance of grant writing to their personal promotion and tenure. It is interesting to note that recognition of this type was received by a majority of those surveyed whom had been considered for promotion. This recognition can be partially attributed to efforts within the College Grants Office to promote research and scholarly works.

Although recognition seems to be a topic of concern within the College of Education a very small number of respondents actually thought that recognition within a college publications was important. This was interesting within the context that issues of financial support rated higher on this same scale. Having the opportunity to support new research ideas and having the ability to purchase new equipment and resources both rated as very important by over half of those who responded.

In an attempt to help faculty members succeed at obtaining these rewards the College Grant Office offered administrative guidance and technical support. The Grants Office hired two research and editorial assistants for editing a newsletter, listing opportunities, conducting literature searches, and serving as proof readers. The Grants Office had limited success because faculty simply would not take advantage of the opportunities offered to them. Of those interviewed a majority thought that it was very important to receive help in locating funding opportunities, however, three fifths responded that they had received this assistance on a consistent basis. It would be interesting to discover which of the faculty had consistently received this assistance, it would probably be no surprise that it is probably the most successful grant writers. In addition a majority of those surveyed felt that technical assistance was very important for completion of proposals, although, about one fourth of those had received such support. It must be understood that the P.I. must request this support, and have time to utilize it properly.

Although the College grants office has been highly successful at assisting faculty members in areas such as processing proposals for overnight delivery and providing individual recognition, faculty perception describes needs that are not completely being addressed. It would be interesting in follow-up studies to ask if the faculty had ever requested such assistance they claim to not receive. Both in

Monahan's study and in this survey, faculty members overwhelmingly requested a more tangible commitment by the University such as, release time, and assistance in developing proposals.

Conclusions

Providing tangible support, the College of Education Research Office has placed pressure on faculty to be proactive at grant writing. This survey reveals faculty members attempting to succeed in securing funding and documents the perceived barriers and incentives associated with this support. The majority of the faculty requested more tangible support for their external grant writing efforts.

Texas A&M's College of Education's success at obtaining research funding can partially be attributed to the incentives associated within the university research mission. Directly involved in delivering these incentives is the College Grants Office within the College of Education. The main objective of this office is to promote the establishment of a research culture. This objective was addressed by providing the following assistance: administrative and technical support, policy recommendations, fellows programs, seminars, a research center, and by promoting research and scholarly products published by University faculty.

Faculty perceptions indicated that the College Grants Office was successful in providing recognition among peers. A majority of those who indicated that recognition in college publications was very important, received it. This recognition was accomplished through the development of a research column within the college newsletter, *The FYI,* and by publishing the external funds received in the *External Funding Report*. Moreover, the College Research Office publishes an *External Funding Report* annually that more specifically describes major funded research.

Furthermore, the perceptions of 54% of those surveyed indicated that during administrative consideration for promotion and tenure, successful grant writing was very important. Administration faired favorably, perceptions indicate that 47% of those surveyed received such consideration. These perceptions indicate that the administration has been successful at recognizing grant writing efforts of faculty within the College of Education.

However, Faculty are still requesting tangible support such as release time for proposal development. Of those surveyed 75% perceived that release time was very important to successful proposal preparation. However, only 4% reported that they had ever received such release time. In addition 93% indicated that administrative support such as personnel, travel and equipment was critical during the proposal preparation phase, however, only 18% of the respondents reported ever having been given this type of support.

Faculty have entered an era of competitive grant writing driven by economic survival. The administration and management of the College Grants Office at Texas A&M was moved from under an Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies to an Associate Dean with the only responsibility being research to address these new demands. The following are suggestions for promoting greater grant development activities and are based on barriers perceived by faculty members.

First, university administrators should develop a system that will provide faculty members with release time for preparing grant proposals. Funds to support release time could be generated in a variety of ways.

There is no way any of these recommendations can adequately be accomplished without a proactive and cooperative attitude by the faculty. The days of individual faculty entrepreneurship are over. Without collaboration, both between faculty inside and across departmental lines, and with our public (university/school partnerships), most larger proposals will not be successful.

Departments must manage all these awards as a part of the total departmental budget. As such, Principal Investigators should write into their budgets funds for lease of departmentally owned computers, printers, etc. The department could buy the equipment and the grant could lease it from the department. By the time the grant is over, the equipment could be owned by the department. Moreover, operating expenses could be leveraged with departmental funds to enable these funds to be increased. Staff and graduate assistants could also be shared with the department, with the salary savings accruing from the department's portion being designated to support grant development for all the faculty. These steps are being done in some departments and it greatly enhances all programmatic operations. This researcher believes all department heads should implement them as well.

Second, university administrators should make every effort to provide start up money for competitive grant writing. (The college grants office has limited funds for this but university support is needed to provide more funding.) These grants should not be limited to the hard sciences, but the competition should be open to all. Administrators need to deliver support such as personnel, travel and equipment that is deemed necessary for the development process.

Third, administrators need to continue to place emphasis on grant writing skills, by emphasizing their importance to the livelihood of the university. Currently the only rewards come to successful awards. Because of the enormous time requirement for submitting a proposal, faculty become discouraged when not funded. Because the success rate nationally, across all fields, is only about .3, most faculty feel their time is much better spent in writing for publication. Grant *writing* should be recognized as well as funded.

Fourth, creation of a college grants office is essential. As discussed prior, the grants office within the college of education has tremendous short term success,

having gone from having only about a half a dozen faculty involved in the grants process in 1990 to having over half (56) become successful Principal Investigators.

Finally, universities should try to directly associate incentives to support faculty ideas and projects. Of those surveyed, 76% indicated that grant writing was important to them because this type of funding allowed them to support promising ideas and build a reputation for their program (56%). The ability to secure funding for needed equipment also captured faculty attention with 52% responding that this was very important. Personal interests tend to drive faculty members goals and enthusiasm toward grant writing. We need to do all we can to cultivate this interest.

Please rate the frequency you experience the following factors:

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Rar
I receive release time to prepare a proposal	2%	2%	4%	25%
I receive release time to work on a successful grant	20%	12%	18%	14%
There is a return to the department of a portion of the indirect cost derived from the grant	37%	24%	22%	2%
I am provided personnel support (e.g. GA, Secy) for proposal preparation	21%	15%	21%	14%
I am provided administrative support (e.g. extra travel funds, or equipment) for proposal preparation	9%	9%	29%	18%
Successful grants provide benefits in promotion and tenure reviews	47%	28%	15%	4%
Successful grants provide favorable review for merit pay increases	50%	15%	17%	6%
I receive recognition in college publications	30%	25%	33%	10%

Which of the following factors serve most to discourage you from becoming involved in grant-seeking and grant-writing activities?

	Very Much	Much	Somewhat	Rarely	Not at all
Heavy teaching load	24%	15%	36%	16%	9%
Interfere with instructional program	18%	14%	36%	21%	11%
Grants do not provide equivalent reward system as other parts of faculty mission	14%	14%	33%	28%	11%
Receive information too late to prepare competitive proposal	20%	20%	39%	15%	6%
Heavy student advising load	22%	9%	33%	18%	18%
Other scholarly or entrepreneurial interests	18%	25%	26%	19%	12%
Departmental or College Assignments	16%	23%	32%	18%	11%
Campus review/approval requirements	4%	9%	28%	37%	22%
Sponsor rules or regulations (i.e., requirement for matching)	2%	12%	39%	31%	16%
Lack of training in grant seeking and grant writing	14%	9%	33%	30%	14%
Lack of knowledge of funding sources	14%	15%	34%	23%	14%
Lack of knowledge of budgeting	8%	12%	18%	35%	27%
Too much work and bother	16%	11%	47%	15%	11%
No colleagues with whom to work	3%	16%	41%	16%	24%

From a faculty perspective, how important are the following factors relative to grant writing and grant development:

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
Release time to prepare a proposal	42%	33%	21%	4%
Release time to work on a successful grant	68%	23%	9%	0
Return to department of a portion of the indirect cost derived from the grant	56%	33%	9%	2%
Personnel support (secretarial help or graduate assistants	57%	32%	11%	0
Opportunity to recruit for top quality graduate students for program	58%	27%	13%	2%
Administrative support (extra travel funds or equipment)	55%	38%	7%	0
Consideration in promotion and tenure decisions	54%	30%	10%	6%
Recognition in college publications	18%	25%	36%	21%
Other forms of public recognition	13%	25%	45%	17%
Personal financial compensation	40%	30%	25%	5%
Satisfaction of obtaining the grant	47%	37%	16%	0
Having the opportunity to support promising ideas or research	76%	20%	4%	0
Having resources to acquire much needed equipment	52%	36%	12%	0
Gaining recognition for my institution	19%	63%	13%	5%
Building reputation for program	56%	38%	4%	2%

Please mark the importance of the college grants office of providing you the following technical assistance

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
How to look for grant opportunities	47%	27%	18%	8%
How to write competitive proposals	41%	28%	24%	7%
How to prepare an accurate and adequate budget	49%	23%	26%	2%
How to get the necessary administrative approvals	54%	30%	13%	3%
How to deal with prospective sponsors	36%	38%	15%	11%
How to deal with the college business office	32%	34%	25%	9%
Processing forms for signature	48%	37%	9%	6%
Processing proposal package for overnight delivery	38%	33%	19%	10%
Providing copies of completed package to P.I. and serving as liaison with University sponsored research office	48%	33%	19%	0
Obtaining answers to questions from funding source during proposal preparation phase	33%	44%	13%	10%
Assistance with budget preparation	43%	35%	19%	3%
Providing writing assistance (i.e., providing technical writing assistance)	26%	37%	24%	13%

Please rate the frequency you received the following technical assistance

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
How to look for grant opportunities	23%	36%	28%	13%
How to write competitive proposals	2%	26%	34%	38%
How to prepare an accurate and adequate budget	13%	35%	35%	17%
How to get the necessary administrative approvals	24%	31%	24%	21%
How to deal with prospective sponsors	6%	20%	33%	41%
How to deal with the college business office	9%	30%	26%	35%
Processing forms for signature	35%	31%	15%	19%
Processing proposal package for overnight delivery	25%	30%	25%	21%
Providing copies of completed package to P.I. and serving as liaison with University sponsored research office	23%	30%	26%	21%
Obtaining answers to questions from funding source during proposal preparation phase	17%	26%	26%	31%
Assistance with budget preparation	19%	43%	19%	19%
Providing writing assistance (i.e., providing technical writing assistance)	4%	24%	33%	39%

REFERENCES

Burgoon, M. (1988). Extramural funding or extracurricular research: That is the choice. A research editorial. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 52, 252-258.

Churchman, D.A. & Hellweg, S.A. (1981). The fault is not in our stars: Self-generated obstacles to securing grants. Grants Magazine, 4, 106-110.

Cook, D. & Loadman, W. E. (1984). Developing instrumentation to reflect perceptions and attitudes toward proposal development. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44, 283-299.

Gallaher, Irene & Daniel, Larry G. (1989, November) Barriers to Faculty Involvement in Grant-Related Activities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Research Association, Little Rock, AR. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314-975

Harris, K. (1985). Effect of prior experience on decision to submit proposals. Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, 16(4), 29-35.

Lischwe, S., Manning, L.O., & Willimann, J. (1987). Encouraging the research process: SIUE's experimental grants seminar for faculty. Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, 18(3), 49-53.

Meyer, K. (1989). Disincentives to grants: A return on investment. Grants Magazine, 12(3), 121-131.

Mishler, J. M. (1987). Institutional, academic unit, and faculty objectives and priorities to enhance campus wide sponsored research. Grants Magazine, 10, 137-142.

Monahan, Thomas C. (1993). Barriers and Inducements to Grant-Related Activity by New Jersey State College Faculty. Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, 25(4), 9-25.